

FILED 17 MAR 20 15:47 USC-ORP

Ronald-Kenneth: Strasser AR WP  
Non-Resident Alien  
c/o 8800 Southeast 80 Avenue  
non-domestic  
Portland  
Oregon Republic  
Multnomah, County  
Zip Exempt

Not an Attorney  
Not Pro Se  
Not Representing Myself  
Demand Fee Waiver

**In the United States District Court**  
**for the District of Oregon**

STATE OF OREGON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 3:20cr00102 SI
	)	
RONALD K STRASSER, Jr,	)	Yamhill Case No. 18CR44897
	)	
Defendant,	)	<b>RENEWED</b>
	)	<b>EMERGENCY NOTICE</b>
Ronald-Kenneth: Strasser,	)	<b>OF REMOVAL AND DEMAND</b>
	)	<b>FOR INJUNCTION/TRO</b>
Claimant.	)	<b>(Federal) DEMAND TRIAL BY JURY</b>

To whoever reads this: Are you properly in office, whoever you are? What is your name?  
Do you have a claim against me? Do you know anyone who has a claim against me? I demand  
the order of the court be released unto me, does anyone object?

I am that I am, acting as the authorized representative for the Ens Legis, am I not? And  
the Ens Legis is the legal Defendant, is it not?

Pursuant to 18 USC and 1446 and 1455, I hereby remove this case, Yamhill County  
Circuit Court case 18CR44897, to this Federal Court, do I not, and does anyone object?

**Relief on the injunction/TRO is needed by 5:00 pm Tuesday, March 17, 2020,**  
because a "Hearing – Trial Readiness" has been scheduled for 3:30 PM on 3/19/2020, and a

“Trial – Twelve Person Jury” has been scheduled for 9:00 AM on 3/24/2020, and because if the injunction/TRO is denied then I will need several days to hire an attorney, even though I am not the Ens Legis (although no one has ever proved that I am the accommodating party for the surety in the matter, and there is no gold and silver money), (and even though the Yamhill County Circuit lacks jurisdiction for multiple reasons) and because there have been no facts brought forth in this case, and because there was never a Verified Complaint, and because the attorney who filed the case is a debt collector, and because I am here only by threats, duress and coercion by necessity, does anyone disagree? Who has put up their Oath of Office, with bond, to indemnify me from irreparable harm/injury?

On or about July 6, 2018, someone who was not properly in office, and who was otherwise authorized, and without a verified complaint from an injured party, and without due process, under color of law, filed an insufficient, false and fraudulent document titled “Indictment” into the Yamhill County Circuit Court (“State Court”) as Case No. 18CR44897, does anyone disagree? This act was a violation of 18 USC 241, 242, 1341, 1661, does anyone disagree?

No Complaint has ever been filed in Case No. 18CR44897, does anyone disagree?

The People have never filed anything into Case No. 18CR44897, does anyone disagree?

No injured party is identified in any document in Case No. 18CR44897, does anyone disagree? The State of Oregon does not claim to be an injured party, does anyone disagree?

Mark G. Obert is participating in Case No. 18CR44897, without validating who he is, is he not? Is it not so, that he is nothing but a third-party debt collector (interloper)? Mark G. Obert has been served with a document RESCINDING AND REVOKING ANY AND ALL POWERS OF ATTORNEY, has he not?

The Indictment is vague, is it not? The Indictment alleges: "The defendant, RONALD KENNETH STRASSER, Jr, on or about March 18, 2018, in Yamhill County, Oregon, did unlawfully and knowingly commit theft of personal items, of the value of one thousand dollars or more, the property of P.A.W." does it not? Stripped of these mere legal conclusions, the Indictment fails to allege facts constituting a justiciable controversy, does anyone disagree? Is it not true that an attorney cannot testify or admit evidence according to Trinsey v. Pagliaro?

These alleged "personal items" are never identified, are they? This "P.A.W." is never identified, is it? This "P.A.W." cannot be a resident of, or a citizen of, or a part of, or a member of, State of Oregon, because there is no such thing as "State of Oregon," does anyone disagree?

The plaintiff STATE OF OREGON lacks standing, does it not? "The requirement of standing, however, has a core component derived directly from the Constitution. ***A plaintiff must allege personal injury fairly traceable to the defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct and likely to be redressed by the requested relief.***" pursuant to Allen v. Wright, 468 U.S. 737, 751 (1984), does anyone disagree? In pursuance thereof: If a plaintiff lacks standing, then courts, all courts, are legally/constitutionally incapable of proceeding because: "courts only adjudicate justiciable controversies." United States v. Interstate Commerce Commission, 337 US 426, 430, does anyone disagree? In pursuance thereof: The "Supreme Court" has held consistent with this principal: "the duty of this court, as of every judicial tribunal, is limited to determining rights of persons or of property, which are actually controverted in the particular case before it." Tyler v. Judges of the Court of Registration, 179 US 405, does anyone disagree? Standing consists of two absolutely essential elements: 1) violation of a legal right, and 2) personal injury, does anyone disagree? The allegations are not in the indictment and that's fatal, does anyone disagree? It's not "legally" sufficient to just make allegations, those allegations must be based on facts; those facts

must establish where, when, why and how the legal right was allegedly acquired; and if facts are alleged, then they must be based on the testimony of witnesses with personal knowledge, Rule 602 Federal Rules of Evidence, does anyone disagree? There are no facts to prove where, when, why and how the Constitution of Oregon, or any statute passed under it, or anything done under it, is applicable to me, does anyone disagree? Pursuant to *Perry v. United States*, 294 U.S. 330 (1935), a personal injury cannot be proven because it cannot be proven the "United States" had a right to the property in question or the "required" action, does anyone disagree?

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446, this Notice of Removal is timely filed within thirty days after the receipt by me, otherwise than through service, of a copy of the initial pleading setting forth the claim for relief upon which this action or proceeding is based, does anyone disagree?

There are no other defendants, other than the one all-capitals *Ens Legis*, so there is no one else who needs to consent to the removal of the action, does anyone disagree?

The Defendant (the all-capitals *Ens Legis*) has taken no action in the State Court that would prejudice the right to removal, does anyone disagree?

The United States District Court has original jurisdiction over this case under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (Federal Question) because, when passing ORS 164.055, under which I am accused, Oregon used Federal power delegated from Congress and the U.S. Constitution (1:8:17 and the Supremacy Clause and the various emergency/martial-law clauses); and because the questions presented to the Yamhill County Court include, among others, the question of whether the Yamhill County Court has Federal jurisdiction; and because ???; and because the term "State" when used in the U.S. Code (and all other Federal law) refers exclusively to Federal entities (and this is the definition that controls, because of the Supremacy Clause) therefore "State of Oregon" (my accuser) is a Federal entity; and because I cannot confront my accuser in any but a Federal

court, as “State of Oregon” cannot be sued in its own courts without its consent; and because State of Oregon (my accuser) has a Federal Employer Identification Number (EIN) as well as a Dun & Bradstreet number, thus State of Oregon is a Federal entity; and because Yamhill County has a Federal Employer Identification Number (EIN) as well as a Dun & Bradstreet number, thus the Yamhill County Court is a Federal entity; and because the Yamhill County Court has a Federal Employer Identification Number (EIN) as well as a Dun & Bradstreet number, thus the Yamhill County Court is a Federal entity; and because ???; and because Yamhill County fails to have the form of government guaranteed “to every State in this Union” by the United States in U. S. Const IV.4, because the statutes passed by the Legislature are not enforced or interpreted by the other two branches, which instead do whatever they please, do they not? (although I am not a party to the Constitution, am I?), does anyone disagree?

The United States District Court has original jurisdiction over this case under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) because the amount in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000 exclusive of interest and costs (according to the undisclosed managerials and the financials) (and valuing my time according to the precedent which was set in TREZEVANT V. CITY OF TAMPA, 241 F.2d 336 (11th Cir. 1984) at \$1,086 per minute, \$75,000 per hour, and \$1,800,000 per day), and because the action is between citizens of a State (namely STATE OF OREGON, Foreperson of the Grand Jury, and Brad Berry) and a foreigner (namely me, or else the fictional Ens Legis RONALD KENNETH STRASSER, Jr), does anyone disagree? The face of the Complaint shows the plaintiff’s name as STATE OF OREGON, although STATE OF OREGON never signed the Indictment, and the only name on the Indictment is Brad Berry, however both of them are citizens of Oregon, does anyone disagree? I am not a “citizen” of Oregon, does anyone disagree? I am not domiciled in “this state” as defined in ORS 131.205, nor in “The State of

Oregon” as established by the Army (according to the Lieber Code, General Rule 100), does anyone disagree?

To the extent that the statutes allow removal for civil cases but disallow removal for criminal cases, those statutes are unconstitutional, does anyone disagree? Congress knows that there is a disparate racial impact between civil and criminal cases, and between removal of civil cases and removal of criminal cases, and Congress intended to discriminate, does anyone disagree? In addition, ORCP 2 states: “There shall be one form of action known as a civil action.” and therefore Yamhill Case No. 18CR44897 must be a civil action, does anyone disagree? This issue (namely, whether Yamhill Case No. 18CR44897 qualifies for removal) can only be ruled on by the United States District Court, not by a clerk and not by the Yamhill County Court, does anyone disagree?

To the extent that the statutes allow removal for Federal Question cases and Diversity cases but disallow removal for this type of case, those statutes are unconstitutional, does anyone disagree? Congress knows that there is a disparate racial impact between Federal Question cases and Diversity cases and this type of case, and between removal of Federal Question cases and Diversity cases and removal of this type of case, and Congress intended to discriminate, does anyone disagree?

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1455, there is good cause for leave for the filing of this Notice of Removal: the purported prosecutor and Yamhill County Circuit Court staff and agents including Bradley C. Berry and John Collins and unknown named employees #1-50 and the Yamhill County Sheriff’s Department staff and agents including Tim Svenson and unknown named deputies #1-50 have committed crimes including violations of 18 USC 241, 242, 1341, 1661, does anyone disagree? The grounds for removal are that the purported State employees are

proceeding in spite of the fact that the State court lacks jurisdiction (personam jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction and territorial jurisdiction) and that all relevant land had never been ceded to the Federal government<sup>1</sup>, and that the case register shows that I have been seeking and making numerous attempts and initiating and conducting dynamic negotiations while Bradley C. Berry has acquiesced in all of my positions in which I have raised all the necessary questions to establish whether there is a True Bill with specific facts and harm or damage and an injured party sufficient to allege a crime and whether or not I am the "person" referenced in the statutes, and that there is a surety and a bond amount but there is no amount on the Bill, and that everything has been done under color of statutes, rules codes and regulations, in other words under color of law, in a military venue under an emergency-rule martial law jurisdiction which do not apply to me, does anyone disagree?

The attorney general of every state can be subpoenaed into a courtroom to testify to the constitutionality of the act I am charged with violating, does anyone disagree? Every codified law must also be certified as constitutional by the supreme court of the state before it can be implemented, does anyone disagree? The sole legal justification used by both Federal and State authorities today, to subject the American People to statutes such as the ORS, is presumption of residence in the District of Columbia, does anyone disagree?

The current Oregon government is aptly described pursuant to this case, does anyone disagree?:

---

<sup>1</sup> Prior to February 1, 1940, it was presumed that the United States accepted jurisdiction whenever the state offered it because the donation was deemed a benefit. See *Fort Leavenworth R.R. Co. v. Lowe*, 114 U.S. at 528. This presumption was reversed by enactment of the Act of February 1, 1940, codified at 40 U.S.C. § 255. This statute requires the head or authorized officer of the agency acquiring or holding property to file with the state a formal acceptance of such "jurisdiction, exclusive or partial as he may deem desirable," and further provides that in the absence of such filing "it shall be conclusively presumed that no such jurisdiction has been acquired." See *Adams v. United States*, 319 U.S. 312.



'But there is another description of government, called also by publicists a government de facto, but which might, perhaps, be more aptly denominated a government of paramount force. Its distinguishing characteristics are (1) that its existence is maintained by active military power within the territories, and against the rightful authority of an established and lawful government; and (2) that while it exists it must necessarily be [229 U.S. 416, 429] obeyed in civil matters by private citizens who, by acts of obedience rendered in submission to such force, do not become responsible, as wrongdoers, for those acts, though not warranted by the laws of the rightful government. Actual governments of this sort are established over districts differing greatly in extent and conditions. They are usually administered directly by military authority, but they may be administered, also, by civil authority, supported more or less directly by military force.' *Thornington v. Smith*, 8 Wall. 1, 9, 19 L. ed. 361, 363.

does anyone disagree? Peace was never declared after the civil war, and we are still functioning under the war powers; WWII never ended in the States; the judiciary act of 1948 was a wartime act; peace did not come with Germany and Japan until after Korea was started which is still going on; UN was founded and entered into during WWII; the Oregon statutes read as if WWII war powers are still in effect; the national and state Constitutions have been suspended; we lost our law, which is supposed to be certified as constitutional before it can be implemented; there is NO REMEDY; this explains the Rule of Necessity: you cannot claim to be a citizen of a State or the U.S. because neither exist as de jure governments, they are governments de facto, does anyone disagree? I will subpoena the certification of the relevant statutes by the Oregon Supreme Court, and I will subpoena Oregon's Attorney General to testify to the constitutionality of the relevant statutes, and the said statutes have not and will not be certified as constitutional, and Oregon's Attorney General will not testify to the constitutionality of the act, does anyone disagree? You need 3 things to be a nation under international law: 1. de jure money 2. de jure law 3. a de jure army; and we have none of these; we are a nation de facto, does anyone disagree? If there is no remedy there can be no charges of violating a law; it has always been understood that there MUST be a remedy for every violation of law, does anyone disagree?



I have no contract with State of Oregon, does anyone disagree? Pursuant to:

"Nothing can be more material to the obligation than the means of enforcement. Without the remedy the contract may, indeed, in the sense of the law, be said not to exist, and its obligation to fall within the class of those moral and social duties which depend for their fulfillment wholly upon the will of the individual. The ideas of validity and remedy are inseparable, and both are parts of the obligation, which is guaranteed by the Constitution against invasion. The obligation of a contract 'is the law which binds the parties to perform their agreement.'" Von Hoffman v. City of Quincy, 4 Wall. 535, 552. red CROSS LINE vs. ATLANTIC FRUIT COMPANY. No. 112. SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 264 U.S. 109, 68 L.Ed. 582, 44 S. Ct. 274 (1924).

does anyone disagree? Pursuant to 28 USC 2403, I hereby respectfully demand that the court shall certify to Oregon's attorney general that the constitutionality of the relevant Oregon

Revised Statutes affecting the public interest is drawn in question, does anyone object?

Once Jurisdiction is challenged it must be proved according to Hagens v. Lavine, 4154.5.533; Weishuhn v. Catholic Diocese of Lansing Mich 279 Mich App 150-155, 756 NW.2d 483 (2008) & (2010); Oakland County v. Human Services, Mich App (2010); Cork v. Applebee's of Michigan Inc., 239 Mich.App 311, 608 NW.2d 62 (2000); HR 1491 (1933); McDonald v. City of Chicago that brought 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment; 245 (Challenge of Jurisdiction); Owens v. City of Independence, correct?

### **Injunction**

I demand an injunction stopping Mark G. Obert from proceeding in Yamhill County Circuit Court, does anyone object?

I am likely to win this case because the Yamhill County Circuit Court lacks personam jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction and geographical jurisdiction, does anyone disagree? I am likely to win this case because there is no Complaint and no allegation of any injured party, and because the Indictment is vague, does anyone disagree? I am likely to win this case because the

only proper court for me is a court of common-law jurisdiction where there must be an injured party, does anyone disagree?

Without an injunction, I am likely to suffer irreparable harm, because John Collins or another black-robed administrator is likely to move forward with a martial-law proceeding disguised as a legitimate court trial, even though the court lacks jurisdiction, does anyone disagree?

An Ens Legis (both the Plaintiff Ens Legis and the Defendant Ens Legis) cannot suffer harm, does anyone disagree? The harm that I would suffer, if I am evicted and then turn out to be right, far exceeds the harm that Mark G. Obert or State of Oregon would suffer, or that STATE OF OREGON would suffer, if the trial is delayed a while and then I turn out to be wrong, because for me it is a question of being imprisoned, and imprisonment is very hard on people, whereas for the attorneys it is just a question of one court date versus a different court date, and because any hypothetical emergency that may have existed (justifying martial law rule) must be over by now, and because in all this time no one has complained about a specific emergency, does anyone disagree?

The unlawful prosecution and imprisonment of people tends to alarm the public, does anyone disagree?

***RESCINDING AND REVOKING ANY AND ALL CONSENT AND POWERS FOR ATTORNEY***

May I give notice that I hereby rescind and revoke any and all Consent, and I hereby rescind and revoke any and all Power(s) for Attorney that I may have ever granted in the past to Frank Wall, Keith Dieringer, Catherina Dieringer, Barbara Marcille, Steven K. Bushong, Leslie Roberts, Carol (Supervisor on Second Floor), and any other agent for the Corporation that

through presumption or assumption of the more than twelve to twenty-one presumptions for personam and subject-matter jurisdiction, including any and all Power(s) for Attorney assumed, presumed, by anyone in any court panel?

May I now accept and admonish the challenge to personam and subject matter jurisdiction until that jurisdiction can be proven, this matter will cease until the challenge has been proven, will it not?

May I point out that I have never knowingly, willingly nor voluntarily granted any Consent nor any Power for Attorney to anyone in any court system?

Hereby, if you don't mind, I am disavowing and disaffirming, back to the date for infancy, am I not?

Who in these proceedings is going to indemnify my right for subrogation? Do you know that I value my time, for calculating damages, at two thousand Gold Dollars per half hour?

In pursuance of 28 USC 1746, I hereby declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct, and executed on March 15, 2020, does anyone object?

By: :/s/...V.C. Ronald-kenneth:Strasser, Sui Juris  
:/s/...V.C. Ronald-kenneth:Strasser, Sui Juris

WP

Pur. 1-103

17 March, 2020

**Certificate for Service**

I certify that on the date written below I served a true copy of the foregoing on the following parties by email and U.S. mail, does anyone disagree?

Mark G. Obert  
1215 NW Adams St Ste A  
PO Box 626  
McMinnville OR 97128  
Email: mobert@johnstone-law.com

By: ~~:/s/...V.C. Ronald-kenneth:Strasser, Sui Juris~~ WP  
:/s/...V.C. Ronald-kenneth:Strasser, Sui Juris PW. 1-103

17 March, 2020

Verified Correct Copy of Original 7/6/2018

**FILED**  
JUL 06 2018IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON  
FOR THE COUNTY OF YAMHILLSTATE OF OREGON,  
Plaintiff,

INDICTMENT

vs.

RONALD KENNETH STRASSER, Jr  
DOB: 04/13/1959  
SID#: 04691034 FPN:Court#: 18CR44897  
DA#: 180655

Defendant.

The above-named defendant is accused by the Grand Jury by this Indictment as follows:

**Count 1: Theft in the First Degree**  
(FSG=3; C Felony ORS 164.055)  
Committed as follows:**Count 1: Theft in the First Degree**

The defendant, Ronald Kenneth Strasser, Jr., on or about March 18, 2018, in Yamhill County, Oregon, did unlawfully and knowingly commit theft of personal items, of the value of one thousand dollars or more, the property of P.A.W.

This act contrary to statute and against the peace and dignity of the State of Oregon.

DATED: 7-5-18WITNESSES GIVING TESTIMONY:  
(in person unless otherwise indicated)Deputy A. McMahon  
P. Westberry  
K. Hart  
W. HenryX A TRUE BILLB. D.  
Foreperson of the Grand Jury[Signature]  
District AttorneyINDICTMENT  
Page 1DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
Yamhill County Courthouse  
McMinnville, Oregon 97128 (503) 434-7539 Fax (503) 434-5760  
districtattorneyoffice@co.yamhill.or.us

Verified Correct Copy of Original 7/6/2018

☐ The State does not request a warrant at this time.

☒ The State moves the Court for an order directing that a warrant issue for the arrest of the defendant and that security be set in the amount of \$ 7,500

☐ The District Attorney designates this Indictment as CONFIDENTIAL until such time as the Defendant has been arrested and held to answer the charges.

by:   
District Attorney or Deputy

### CLERK'S CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify this copy to be a true, full and correct copy of the original record in my office.

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of the Circuit Court

Based on the above motion, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that a warrant issue for the arrest of the defendant named herein and that security in connection with said arrest(s) in the amount of \$ 7,500

Signed: 7/8/2018 09:26 PM



\_\_\_\_\_  
Circuit Court Judge John L. Collins

Arresting Agency Case #: 18000954 MNS / Yamhill County Sheriff's Office

Case assigned to: Holly Winter  
Deputy District Attorney  
Oregon State Bar No. 115596

INDICTMENT  
Page 2

DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
Yamhill County Courthouse  
McMinnville, Oregon 97128 (503) 434-7539 Fax: (503) 434-5760  
districtattorneyoffice@co.yamhill.or.us